REMARKS

In the final Office Action dated March 28, 2003, claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Claim 3 has been canceled. Note that claims 1, 11, and 17 are independent claims from which all other claims depend therefrom.

A newly submitted information disclosure statement is attached herein, which includes a concise explanation of the relevance of each reference cited, which are not in the English language, so that the references may now be considered.

Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan (U.S. 6,184,781) and Henley (U.S. 5,657,073). Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of originally filed claim 3.

Claim 1 is now directed towards a vehicle data acquisition and display assembly that includes two or more image acquisition apparatuses. The image apparatuses are disposed upon a vehicle and acquire images of an environment in which the vehicle resides. A video processing assembly receives the acquired images and in response thereto creates a mosaic image of the environment. A display is disposed within the vehicle and displays at least a portion of the mosaic. An image control assembly selects a first portion of the mosaic to be displayed. The data acquisition and display assembly monitors one or more attributes of the vehicle and in response to the attributes displays a second portion of the mosaic.

Ramakesavan is directed towards a rear looking vision system that utilizes three cameras to monitor a scene behind a vehicle. Multiple image frames of the scene are stitched together to form a composite image of the scene that is rearward of the vehicle.

Henley is directed towards an imaging system that provides a panoramic view using multiple cameras. The imaging system includes a pan-tilt-rotate-zoom controller that selects a portion of a panoramic image to be viewed.

Ramakesavan and Henley alone or in combination to not teach or suggest monitoring one or more attributes of a host vehicle and in response to the attributes displaying a second portion of a generated mosaic. Ramakesavan does not teach monitoring host vehicle attributes and displaying portions of a mosaic in response to the attributes, as appears to be suggested in paragraph 5 of the Final Office Action. Ramalesavan simply teaches flashing an image of a detected vehicle to indicate to a vehicle operator that the detected vehicle is along side the host vehicle. Since Henley is not even directed towards a vehicle application, Henley also does not teach or suggest monitoring vehicle attributes and displaying portions of a mosaic in response thereto. Therefore, claim 1 is novel and nonobvious and is now in a condition for allowance.

Claims 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan and Henley as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Kiridena et al. (U.S. 6,429,789). Claim 4 includes the limitations of claim 1 and further includes the limitation of the data acquisition and display assembly, of the present invention, senses maneuvering of the vehicle and in response thereto displays a third portion of the mosaic.

Kiridena is directed towards a vehicle information acquisition and display assembly. Kiridena utilizes sensors to monitor a field of view forward of a host vehicle. Kiridena teaches monitoring speed of the host vehicle and conditions external to the vehicle, such as presence of an intersection or of icy wet conditions, to adjust size of the field of view in the direction of travel of the host vehicle. Kiridena, like Ramakesavan and Henley, does not teach displaying a portion of the field of view in response to maneuvers of the vehicle, let alone displaying a portion of a mosaic. Speed of a vehicle and external conditions of a

vehicle are not the same as direction of travel of a vehicle. Thus, claim 4 is also novel and nonobvious and in a condition for allowance.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Schofield et al. (U.S. 5,949,331) and Wright et al. (U.S. 6,161,066). Claim 11 is direct towards an assembly for use with a vehicle of the type having a roof. The assembly includes multiple cameras that are disposed upon the roof and that cooperatively provide images of an environment in which the vehicle resides. A display assembly selectively displays the cooperatively provided images. A controller having a touch sensitive surface upon which an icon is disposed controls selecting a first portion of the cooperatively provided images by use of the touch sensitive surface and causes the selected first portion to be displayed by the display assembly. The controller monitors one or more attributes of the vehicle and in response to the attributes displays a second portion of the images.

Schofield is directed towards display enhancements for a vehicle vision system and Wright is directed towards an emergency response system. As with Ramakesavan and Henley, neither Schofield nor Wright, alone or in combination, teach or suggest generating images from multiple cameras, displaying a first portion of the images, monitoring one or more attributes of a host vehicle, and in response to the attributes displaying a second portion of the images. Thus, claim 11 is also novel and nonobvious and is in a condition for allowance.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan and Henley as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Okude et al. (U.S. 6,157,342). Claim 17 is directed towards a method of acquiring and selectively displaying images to be viewed within a vehicle. The method includes the limitations of generating a voice command and using the voice command to select at least a portion of multiple images.

Okude is directed towards a navigation device that has a voice input and output device, which converts a given signal into a voice signal, recognizes voice uttered by a user, and forms a signal based thereon. Okude does not teach or suggest selecting a portion of multiple images in response to a voice command as is suggested by the Final Office Action. By combining a rearward looking vision system that provides a composite image of a rearward environment of a vehicle with that of a navigation system that recognizes voice command does not allow one to arrive at the present invention.

Moreover to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met, under MPEP 2142. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the second reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. There is no suggestion in either Ramakesavan, Henley, or in Okude to combine the teachings of each reference and the combination thereof does not teach or suggest all the limitation of claim 17, as stated above. Thus, claim 17 is also novel and nonobvious and is in a condition for allowance.

Ramakesavan, Henley, Kiridena, Schofield, Wright, and Okude alone or in combination do not teach or suggest generation of multiple images or of a mosaic, displaying a first portion of the images, monitoring a vehicle attribute, and displaying a second portion of the images in response to the vehicle attribute. Also, Ramakesavan, Henley, Kiridena, Schofield, Wright, and Okude alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the limitation of generating a voice command and using the voice command to select at least a portion of the images. Therefore, claims 1, 11, and 17 are novel and nonobvious and are in a condition for allowance. Additionally, since claims 2, 4-10, 12-16, and 18-20

depend from claims 1, 11, and 17, respectively, they are also novel and nonobvious for at least the same reasons.

In light of the amendments and remarks, the Applicants submit that all objections and rejections are now overcome. The Applicants have added no new matter to the application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ P.C.

Jeffrey J. Chapp, Reg. No. 50,579
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: May 28, 2003